

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-21 are pending herein. Claims 14-21 have been withdrawn. Claims 1-13 have been rejected. Responsive to each paragraph of the Office Action, the Applicant has the following remarks:

### **Election/Restriction**

The Applicant affirms the election of Claims 1-13. The remaining claims are withdrawn.

### **Drawings**

The drawings were objected to on the grounds that the protrusions, the apertures, and the springs were not shown. The Applicant has submitted herewith formal drawings that show the recited features. The recitation of a pair of springs in Claim 13 has been revised to a pair of spring plungers.

### **35 U.S.C. § 112**

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 were based upon the drawings. The drawings have been corrected.

### **35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,855,161 to Cortese in light of U.S. Patent No. 1,182,904 to Hamilton, et al. Cortese was described as having a turret frame 2, a turret plate 8, a plurality of apertures 10, and a turret shaft 7. Hamilton was described as showing a rotary shaft connector.

The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Independent Claim 1 specifically recites that the turret shaft connects the turret plate to the turret frame for rotation therewith. There is no indication whatsoever in Cortese that the shaft 7 is connected to the frame 2. In fact, it appears that the plate 8 is supported by and rotates within the frame 2. *See* Figs. 1A, 1B, 2A, and 2B. Further, an actuating device 20 that includes a lever 22 and a free wheel device 23 apparently drives the plate. The use of a


connector such as that shown in Hamilton would simply interfere with the operation of the actuating device 20. Further, the plate also is secured to a lock device 21. The lock device also would need to be removed in some manner. The Applicant thus submits that Cortese cannot be the basis of an obviousness rejection because it lacks each of the limitations called for in the claim and because it is incapable of being modified as described in the rejection.

Further, even if the plate of Cortese could be modified with the connector of Hamilton, there is no suggestion in the references to do so. Cortese is silent on removing the plate. The connector of Hamilton has been around for more than ninety years, but apparently has never applied in this context. Although ease of removing the plate is an advantage of this claim, the prior art is silent on suggesting the combination. *See* MPEP §2143.01(III) (“[t]he mere fact that the references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination.” (Emphasis in the original). The Applicant thus submits that independent Claim 1, and the dependent claims thereon, are patentable over the cited references.

### CONCLUSION

The Applicant believes it has responded to each matter raised in the Office Action. Allowance of all claims is respectfully solicited. Any questions may be directed to the undersigned at 404-853-8028.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel J. Warren  
Reg. No. 34,272

**SUTHERLAND ASBILL & BRENNAN LLP**  
999 Peachtree Street, N.E.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-3996  
(404) 853-8000  
(404) 853-8806 (Facsimile)  
daniel.warren@sablaw.com

SAB Docket No. 25040-1166